UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,231	09/30/2003	Stephen R. Carter	1565.060US1	6382

21186   7590   01/09/2009
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2442	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 October 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _8-14 and 21-29_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _8-14 and 21-29_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/9/2008_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The applicant has amended claims 8 and 21. Claim 8-14 and 21-29 are currently

pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive for two reasons. First, the Examiner could find no support for the applicant's claim

amendment in the applicant's specification. Second, Amdur teaches the use of many different

types of authentication in paragraph 188 and the mentioned biometric data can be considered the

claimed second password.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply

with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant

art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed

invention. Though the applicant's specification mentions passwords (page 6, lines 18-26; page 8,

lines 4-13; page 10, lines 6-16, the random numbers are not part of the alias identity as disclosed

here; page 10, lines 23-25; and page 15, line 28-page 16, line 4 which mentions biometrics), the

applicant's specification does not mention the alias identity information including a random

password and a random principal password as claimed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

It is unclear how a random password and a random principal password are supposed to

differ.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 8-14 and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent Application Publication Number 2008/0134286 by AMDUR et al.

As to claim 8, Amdur teaches a method for policy and attribute based access to a resource, comprising: receiving a session request for access to a resource, wherein the session request is sent from a service and includes alias identity information for a principal (paragraph 94, the user's login name is considered the alias), wherein the alias identity information includes a random password and a random principal password (paragraph 188 as explained in the response to arguments section); mapping the alias identity information to identity information of the principal (paragraphs 95-96); authenticating the identity information; acquiring a service contract for the principal, the service, and the resource, wherein the service contract includes selective resource access policies and attributes which are permissibly used by the service on behalf of the principal (paragraphs 95-96); and establishing a session with the service, wherein the session is controlled by the service contract (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 9, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising accessing an identity configuration for the principal in order to acquire the selective resource access policies and attributes included within the service contract (paragraph 96).

As to claim 10, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising denying access attempts made by the service during the session when the access attempts are not included within the service contract (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 11, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising terminating the session when an event is detected that indicates the service contract is compromised or has expired (paragraphs 198-199).

As to claim 12, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising establishing the service contract with the principal prior to receiving the session request (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 13, Amdur teaches the method of claim 12 further comprising reusing the service contract to establish one or more additional sessions with the service, wherein the one or more additional sessions are associated with one or more additional session requests made by the service (paragraphs 93-96).

As to claim 14, Amdur teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the establishing further includes establishing the service contract with the principal in response to a redirection operation performed by a proxy that intercepts a browser request issued from the principal to the service for purposes of accessing the resource (paragraph 88).

As to claim 21, Amdur teaches a policy and attribute based resource session manager, residing in a computer-accessible medium, comprising instructions for establishing a session with a resource, the instructions when executed performing the method of: receiving alias identity information from a service, wherein the alias identity information is associated with a principal (paragraph 94, the user's login name is considered the alias), wherein the alias identity information includes a random password and a random principal password (paragraph 188 as explained in the response to arguments section); requesting a mapping of the alias identity information to principal identity information; requesting authenticating of the identity information (paragraphs 95-96); requesting a service contract for the principal, the service and a resource, wherein the service contract includes selective resource access policies and attributes derived from an identity configuration (paragraphs 95-96); and establishing a session with the service and the resource, wherein the session is controlled by the service contract (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 22, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising, permitting the service to indirectly access an identity store which represents the resource, and wherein the identity store includes secure information related to the principal (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 23, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising terminating the session when the service contract expires or is compromised (paragraphs 198-199).

As to claim 24, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21, wherein the requesting of the mapping further includes interacting with an alias translator (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 25, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21, wherein the requesting of authentication further includes interacting with an identification authenticator (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 26, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising managing the session by acting as an intermediary between the service and a legacy Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) application which has access privileges to the resource (paragraphs 97-103).

As to claim 27, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 26, wherein the receiving further includes intercepting a session request that is issued from the service for the legacy LDAP application, wherein the session request includes the alias identity information (paragraphs 97-103).

As to claim 28, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 27 having instructions further comprising managing the session with respect to the service as if the policy based resource session manager were the legacy LDAP application (paragraphs 97-103).

As to claim 29, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 wherein the instructions for establishing the session further includes defining the selective resource access policies as at least one of a read operation and a write operation and defining the attributes as selective confidential data related to the principal, wherein the policies define operations that are permissible on the attributes, and wherein values for the attributes reside in the resource (paragraphs 95-96).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442